

## **Remarks**

### **Claim Status**

Claims 1-17 are pending but stand rejected. By this paper, no claims have been amended and no new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration in view of the arguments presented below.

### **Response To Examiner's Rejection Of Claims 1-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Citing to claims 1 and 10, which recite the term "a standard sized radio," the Examiner asserts that the specification does not adequately describe what "a standard sized radio" is. Claims 2-9 and claims 11-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 10, respectively. Accordingly, all claims under examination recite "a standard sized radio."

The use of the term "a standard sized radio" without further definition does not leave the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112 unsatisfied. Applicants' obligation under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is to provide a written description of the invention in terms that are full, clear, concise and exact enough to enable a person skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and use the invention. A person of skill in the art of designing vehicle interiors and, in particular, instrument panels to accommodate radios would understand the term "a standard sized radio" to mean a single DIN (180 x 50 mm). This assertion is supported by the 35 U.S.C. § 1.32 Declaration accompanying this paper and which is hereby incorporated herein by reference for the Examiner's consideration.

Furthermore, common experience amongst members of the consuming public further informs an understanding of the term "a standard sized radio" for use in an automobile. Any member of the public visiting any number of stores featuring car audio equipment will recognize that the dimensions of car radios are generally the same and do not vary substantially. For this additional reason, Applicants submit that the term "a standard sized radio" as that term is used in Applicants' disclosure is enabled.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejection has been overcome and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection as to claims 1-17 and allow these claims to issue.

**Response To Examiner's Rejection  
Of Claims 1-17 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112,  
Second Paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-17 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the use of the term "a standard sized radio" is unclear. The arguments set forth in the preceding section amply address this rejection and, for the sake of brevity, will not be repeated here, but rather, are hereby incorporated herein by reference as though fully set forth in this paragraph.

Applicants submit that this rejection has been overcome and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and allows these claims to issue.

**Conclusion**

The Petition Fee in the amount of \$120.00 is being charged to Deposit Account No. 02-3978 via electronic authorization submitted concurrently herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,  
**Paul Wayne Nagy, et al.**

By /Seth E. Rodack/  
Seth E. Rodack  
Reg. No. 45,622  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: August 8, 2008

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.**  
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075-1238  
Phone: 248-358-4400  
Fax: 248-358-3351